MEETING#10-February 11

At a Budget Work Session of the Madison County Board of Supervisors on February 11, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. in the Madison County Fire hall Lounge Room located at 1223 N. Main Street:

PRESENT: Doris G. Lackey, Chair

R. Clay Jackson, Vice-Chair Jonathon Weakley, Member Robert W. Campbell, Member Kevin McGhee, Member

Ernest C. Hoch, County Administrator Leo Tayamen, Finance Director

Supervisor Weakley arrived at 5:38 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Lackey called the meeting to order.

2. Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

The Board of Supervisors commenced their meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

3. Determine Presence of a Quorum/Adoption of Agenda

Chairman Lackey advised that a quorum was present.

Supervisor McGhee moved the adoption of today's Agenda as presented, seconded by Supervisor Jackson. *Ayes: Lackey, Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays (0).*

4: Agenda Items:

Budget Discussions:

Chairman Lackey advised the Board has been requesting agencies/departments to provide an update on their departmental budgets to include: a) any additional revenue requests; and b) to provide justification for any proposed changes being requested.

Skyline CAP:

Kim Frye-Smith, Executive Director, and Carlton Yowell, Finance Director, and Simon Fiscus, Head Director, were present.

Ms. Smith noted that Supervisor Weakley, County liaison, has reviewed the budget document presented on behalf of Skyline CAP. She noted there was a request during the previous year to increase Head Start teacher salaries; the request is also being made in today's presentation in an attempt to bridge the gap between Head Start teachers and County teachers (i.e. \$16,000.00 increase); total departmental budget increase is \$19,585.00.

County funding is also used to assist with:

- Foreclosure prevention
- Emergency home repairs
- Partnering with Rapidan Better Housing (for senior housing)
- ➤ Homeless Prevention Program

Emergency assistance with payment of utility bills was discontinued

- Project Discovery Program
- Office for Operations (utilities/maintenance)
- Association membership

Skyline CAP's total budget is \$2,300,000.00 (+/-)

Foreclosure Prevention Specialist works solely in Madison and Orange Agency budget covers six (6) localities and Skyline CAP administration Grant funding is disbursed among all localities involved in the Head Start Program Currently serves:

- Thirty-six (36) children in Madison
- Eighteen (18) in Rappahannock

- Thirty-eight (38) in Warren
- > Computations are based on dividing the funding amount by the total number of students enrolled in the Head Start Program
- Administration Office is located in Madison
- ➤ Costs for Madison is a littler great than the other participating localities
- About twenty percent (20%) of the Finance Director's time and about five percent (5%) of the Executive Director's time is charged to Head Start
- > Funding for the administration staff is from the Community Services Block Grant
- A portion of funding is set aside for Community Action Agencies
- The Agency does apply for certain grants to assist with housing needs
- Agency provides vouchers that offer rental assistance to qualifying families

Mr. Smith advised the agency does apply for certain grants that are applied to housing needs; the agency stills provides vouchers for the housing assistance program that provides rental assistance to families at a certain income level in the County (i.e. currently serving thirty-eight/thirty-nine families here); most of those receiving services reside in Orange and Greene.

Additional highlights focused on:

- Current total number of rent vouchers (320)
- > Funding earned from fees is then used to fund some sort of housing relates issue
- The Agency is allowed to process up to 340 vouchers
- ➤ The HUD housing process

It's hoped that families participating in the program will benefit from rental counseling and eventually be able to devise a budget and become self-sufficient in the future.

Comments from the Board:

- Is there a breakdown of how much of the total budget is used for Madison County
- The difference in capita cost per student enrolled in the Head Start Program versus those enrolled in the County school system
- > Does the student base change constantly during the school year
- Does Skyline CAP share resources with other local agencies in the County (i.e. social services, MESA)

Additional highlights:

- ► Head Start Program has been in place for about twenty-four (24) years;
- Federal government mandated (in 2007) that all Head Start teachers had to have an associates or bachelor's degree (by 2011)
- Ninety percent (90%) of Head Start teachers now have their bachelor's degree
- > Teachers have over twenty (20) years of experience
- Program has had issues with stability (to maintain teachers)
- > Turnover rate has been at about fifty (50%) turnover rate
- The program no longer offers transportation to the students
- > Teacher salaries are about \$10,000.00-\$12,000.00 below the average pay of the public school system
- > Social Services has 2-3 children in the 3/5 year old range that receive state subsidy and are enrolled in the Head Start Program
- ightharpoonup About twenty percent (20%) of students in the program are considered as being 'homeless'
- > Children who receive services from MESA's program are enrolled in the Head Start Program
- > A Head Start Collaboration Program has been initiated
- ➤ The initiative will look at providing matching funds for Head Start Teacher salaries
- Concerns about the long-term quality of the program

Closing comments:

Ms. Smith noted the Head Start Program is under the umbrella of the Skyline Community Action Partnership; the partnership was designated as the 'grantee' for the federal Head Start Program.

Mr. Fiscus advised the goal of the program is to have high quality personnel in place to help the children be successful; the Head State Program is one of the best in the State. If the budget request is approved, this would greatly improve the quality of the program and the relationship between both educational entities here.

Culpeper Soil & Water Conservation District

Greg Wilchens, District Manager, was present and advised the CSWD's budget request indicates an increase of \$5,630.00, which is \$1,500.00 more than last year's request. Input was provided regarding the County's funding calculations (i.e. based on twelve months and percentage of workload for the locality [Madison's population = 10%; Workload = 30%). Under normal circumstances, \$700,000.00-\$800,000.00 is the CSWCD's entire allocation from the State; during the past two years, research was initiated to assess a voluntary approach to water quality. It was also noted that agricultural landowners could attain fencing at full reimbursement; the program has been handled very aggressively and is well known by citizens throughout the region; the program brings in an extensive amount of revenue and conservation into the five-county region.

Highlights provided:

Water Quality Program:

- Within two years, the voluntary water quality program has grown (from 24 contracts to 149 contracts)
- It's felt the program is an excellent way for farmers to upgrade older fencing
- Contact should be in place for the Robinson River by July 1st.
- Proposed contract will bring in more agriculture/residential cost share for the septic work and more federal dollars into the district and to hire additional staff

Grant funding:

- Funding should be received in July 2015
- Concept for the grant can be expanded
- Additional funding resources can be researched

Mr. Wilchens noted the budget increase is being sought for salary increases; research was done on local governmental salaries and the salaries of other soil and water district employees; the CSWCD's salaries are a bit low; increase is being sought to cover at least nine (9) individuals. Amount of funding being sought from all participating localities is \$196,802.00, which will equal a 14% total increase across the board (for the localities). Information was provided to show a breakdown of how funding is utilized within the organization. The CSWCD is unsure of how the workflow will continue; if sign up is done by June 30^{th} 2015, the State is guaranteeing 100% State reimbursement, although there is no guarantee when reimbursement will be made.

Additional highlights:

- CSWCS provided professional certification
- > Create teaching tools at various schools (through grant funding)
- Project undertaken to correct a drainage problem at the rear parking lot of Wetsel Middle School (i.e. installation of a storm drain)
- First public meetings held on the Rapidan TMDL
- Pushing to have local streams stated for IP development funding

Concerns from the Board:

- Criglersville Elementary School: Parcel extends across to the Robinson River
- Can the County develop a wayside or a park in the area (i.e. natural resource)
- Does the CSWCD participate in any partnerships for this type of endeavor (i.e. funding)

Mr. Wilchens noted the CSWCD could provide conservation input on a possible plan; assess whether there are any groups that can assist with eradication; assess whether a demo could be done for educational purposes; the CSWCD does provide input on natural resource planning.

* County Administrator had to leave the session*

Discussions: Board Discussion:

Salary Study & Adjustments:

- Supervisor Campbell: Advised opposition to the step/grade increase that has been recommended; feels the step/grade is place too high; suggested employees shouldn't be led to believe there an increase until it has been approved; reviewed County salaries and benefits over a period of years and the FY2016 projections; feels some of the proposed increases are out of sync.
- > Supervisor Jackson: Understands comments regarding negotiations; feels there is separation between the private/public sector, as the public sector looks at transparency and the budget is presented as such; support was provided for step increases, but that moving of any funding should be done during the budget process; feels the County has great employees and he doesn't feel competitiveness is

- something that appropriately expresses the County; feels that when salaries are raised, the benefits will automatically increase; noted concerns about the Constitutional Officers; has concerns about some individual salaries; feels some facets of the discussion should be done in closed session; doesn't feel there is a parallel between the school system and the County; feels that Skyline CAP is an exception; feels there are concerns due to there not having been a salary adjustment in quite a while.
- Chairman Lackey: Board has been discussing salary adjustments for the past eighteen months; suggestion was researched after assessing salary ranges of surrounding localities; feels there are terms of fairness and the lack of a salary increase for a while; a five percent increase was done in the past to offset a five percent increase in the VRS amount; feels there are still some County salaries that are below where they should be; feels the most fair thing would be to impose a step adjustment overall cost would be about \$43,000.00 to the County budget; advised the overall increase is noted as a step adjustment and not an overall.
- Supervisor McGhee: Noted the healthcare costs for State employees has steadily increased each year resulting in less take home pay.
- Supervisor Weakley: Agreed that a closed session would be necessary in order to discuss individuals vs. positions; focused on the process undertaken by the Board during the past year.

Closing comments:

- Chairman Lackey: Suggested the step adjustments not be considered (i.e. too high [7% 30% increases]; the adjustment to step with no increase being more than 1.96% to 3% would be a more acceptable starting point; the County could elect not to consider any step adjustments and just implement a COLA for employees.
- Supervisor Jackson: Noted the COLA will be 1.5% overall; feels that positions are only worth so much; in the absence of bonuses, there must be adjustments time served/quality of service in the public sector.
- > Supervisor Campbell: Feels the initial step and grade recommendations are a bit flawed feels the proposal used to establish a step/grade for each position is also flawed; feels the action undertaken by the Board during the past year was reasonable.
- > Supervisor Weakley: Noted the adjusted scale was created in order to get County positions in line with the suggested steps of each position; nothing can be done until the Board takes action.

Conclusion:

It was suggested the Board:

- Consider the step adjustment to each step
- Consider approving a COLA only
- Consider to do nothing at all
- Consider covering any increase in healthcare costs
- Consider moving forward with a combination of any of the above

Concerns were verbalized regarding:

- Supervisor Jackson: Not willing to commit to any of tonight's recommendations; concerned about increase in regional jail funding; no revenue projections have been discussed; prepare a second version of the proposed budget to include a step adjustment only.
- > Chairman Lackey: Urged the Board to at least work to establish something to be factored into the budget and the impact this will have on revenue.
- > Supervisor Campbell: Suggested the Board identify a framework and assess whether to provide disbursements for salary increases (i.e. step, grade, etc.), healthcare or retirement; feels the Board should establish the framework and not the County Administrator.
- Supervisor McGhee: Anticipates there will be a small amount of positions that are out of line; advised the County Administrator has provided insight as to how he'd propose to spend funding for compensation and adjustments.
- Supervisor Weakley: Provided insight as to what methodology Culpeper County used to get salaries in line on the proposed scale; he suggested the budget be prepared to reflect a proposed reduction of 1.5% from the school's request.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to advise the County Administrator the Board is not planning to move forward with any large salary increases.

Regional Jail:

Chairman Lackey noted the costs to the County will be based on whether the Jail Board approves the jail's proposed budget; it's hoped the Jail Board will refrain from passing a budget that will cause the

County's contribution to double. In order to influence the jail's budget, it was suggested the County's representatives vote for an appropriate budget.

- Supervisor Jackson: Noted the citizens elected to serve are in place to represent the Board and to do what's best for the County overall; school salaries are also an overwhelming presence in the proposed FY2016 budget.
- > Supervisor Campbell: Noted the Board has much to deal with in the proposed FY2016 budget at this point; the issues pertaining to the jail can be assessed a little later.

The County Administrator has returned to the meeting process

Capital Improvement Items:

- Supervisor Weakley: Upgraded radio system.
- Supervisor Campbell: Sheriff's vehicles (proposed five-year rotation schedule) [funding could be placed in the sheriff's budget or be earmarked in contingency]; provided an overview of the Sheriff's proposed vehicle rotation, based on need.
- > Supervisor Jackson: Concurred with the need for a rotation schedule; unless a contract is signed with the Sheriff, priorities change as Board members change; suggested the Sheriff be asked to attend another budget session and provide input as to his departmental needs.

The County Administrator provided an overview of the amount of vehicles purchased for the Sheriff's Department during FY2007 to FY2014; it was suggested that a vehicle be purchased in FY2016 and FY2017, if possible, in order to initiate a rotation schedule.

> Supervisor Weakley: Noted that a proper rotation schedule isn't in place; suggested the Sheriff provide some input on future needs for vehicle replacement.

Salary Study:

The County Administrator noted a step increase will cost about \$43,000.00 (\$36,000.00 plus benefits) which equates to an overall one percent (1%) increase; step adjustments noted were based on departmental recommendations and are tied to performance and salary study findings; noted the funding amount will decrease by \$110,000.00 once today's suggestion is taken into consideration.

Question/Suggestions:

- Once the budget is balanced, the Board may consider alternative options if there's additional leftover funding.
- Will Board establish a maximum cap on requested funding
- > Step adjustment will provide a starting point
- Assess how other funding pans out (i.e. regional jail, school system)

The County Administrator focused on some of the recommendations made for specific salaries; some positions weren't recommended for an increase beyond a step adjustment, and some were increased based on the salary study. Input could be provided regarding what each department feels about each of the proposed increases; it was noted the increases are reflected in today's documentation. In closing, he stressed the fact there are department heads with many years of experience; for the past several years, increases have been sought – efforts have been repeatedly denied. Most of these individuals reside here and some are doing an incredible job; the amount of funding being sought isn't that significant.

2. Adjournment

With no further action being required by the Board, on motion of Supervisor Campbell, seconded by Supervisor Weakley, Chairman Lackey adjourned the meeting.

After discussion, Supervisor Campbell moved to amend the motion to adjourn after a quick discussion of the school system, seconded by Supervisor Weakley. Ayes: Lackey, Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0).

School System:

- Supervisor Jackson:
 - a. Salary Increases: State is talking about percent increase across the board for school employees) it's felt the overall increase will be 1.5%; \$400,000.00 is being requested in

- funding for the school system (\$195,000.00 for the 1.5% salary increase); line items for the phone system (i.e. rollover funding)
- b. Phone System: School system is hoping to move forward with the phone system, which could eliminate \$30,000.00 from their proposed budget.
- c. Capital Improvement: Feels the Board and school system need to be discussing capital improvement guidelines; funding should be set aside in increments instead of in huge lump sums
- d. Feels a poor relationship between the school and county isn't beneficial to anyone
- e. Suggested all Board members provide questions to be asked of the school board and superintendent

Supervisor Weakley:

- Facilities: Improvements needed to certain facilities; CIP is an ongoing document and will need to be updated.
- b. Funding should be placed into the capital line item each year.
- c. Budget is a projection only.
- d. Feels the school system is making headway with capital improvement items
- e. School Superintendent presented a 'needs based' budget
- f. School Board noted they're unwilling to refuse the 1.5% salary increase (from local or State funding)

> Supervisor Campbell:

- a. Feels the CIP Committee should be tasked to handle long-range items
- b. School's CIP Committee was established for the school's project
- c. Feels if a specific amount of funding is placed in a CIP fund, this proposal will be accepted by the citizens
- d. School's compensation is increasing but funding for maintenance/mechanics is decreasing
- e. School increased a salary in the past during the year before they were scheduled to retire
- f. Questioned how the school's budget request increased within a two week period
- g. Feels the schools level of transparency has been somewhat questionable

Chairman Lackey:

- a. School's budget noted the possible hire of a new middle school teacher
- b. Call for 'two on two' meeting with the school board, superintendent and finance officer

he County Administrator questioned how the amount of benefits for the school employees is increasing more than the percentage noted; he also commented regarding a new line item added to the school's budget – a new program was started that shows an increase in revenue of \$488,000.00 and has a revenue amount of \$468,000.00 and is \$20,000.00 to the negative.

Discussions also focused on:

- ▶ Basic aide funding, which was noted as being tied to the localities' population.
- > State funding may increase
- Healthcare costs
- Decrease in VRS costs
- School population

With no further action being required by the Board, on motion of Supervisor Campbell, seconded by Supervisor Jackson, Chairman Lackey adjourned the meeting. Ayes: Lackey, Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee. Nays: (0).

Doris G. Lackey, Chairman Madison County Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board of Madison County Board Supervisors

Adopted on: April 14, 2015

Copies: Doris G. Lackey, R. Clay Jackson, Jonathon Weakley, Robert Campbell,

Kevin McGhee, V. R. Shackelford, III & Constitutional Officers



Agenda Budget Work Session Madison County Board of Supervisors Tuesday, February 11, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. Madison County Fire hall Lounge Room 1223 N. Main Street, Madison, Virginia 22727



Agenda Items

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence
- 3. Determine Presence of a Quorum/Adopt Agenda
- **4.** Agenda Items:
 - a. Budget Discussions
 - b. Information/Correspondence (if any)
 - c. Adjournment